

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-22 were pending, objects to claims 3, 5 and 11-16, and rejected claims 1-10 and 17-22. Claims 11-13 have been amended, claims 1-10 and 17-22 have been cancelled and claims 11-16 are pending for reconsideration. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

On page 2 of the Action, the Examiner objected to claims 11-16 and indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. These claims have been so rewritten and it is submitted that these claims have not been narrowed and have the same scope as prior to being made independent and are now allowable. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

Claims 3, 5, and 13 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 3 and 5 are canceled and Claim 13 has been amended to replace "plarization" with "polarization". Therefore, the objection to claims is overcome.

TRAVERSAL OF REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Naito. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, and 19 have been canceled.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

TRAVERSAL OF REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of LaGasse. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of LaGasse. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of LaGasse and further in view of Pan. Claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Law. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Law and further in view of Yee. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Law and further in view of Pan. Claim

10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Law and further in view of LaGasse. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Anderson. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Ramachandran. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Farber. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Yee. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naito in view of Pan.

In the amendments to claims, all rejected claims are canceled and only allowable claims remain. In view of this, the present application is considered to be allowable. Reconsideration by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

It is submitted that claims 11-16 continue to be allowable.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 29, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501